

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action¹, the Examiner rejected claims 1-68 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,883,621 to Iwamura et al. ("*Iwamura*"). By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1-68 to more particularly define the scope of the invention. Claims 1-68 remain pending and under current examination.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-68 as allegedly anticipated by *Iwamura*. Independent claim 1, for example, recites a transmission method comprising, among other things, connection information that "has a hierarchical structure, including information about connections between internal units within the first device". *Iwamura* fails to teach or suggest at least this element of claim 1.

The Examiner asserts that *Iwamura* discloses "a hierarchical connection map or topology map." Even assuming this is true, *Iwamura* does not disclose a map that contains information about the internal connections between units within the devices. For example, see figure 2b, which illustrates the workings of the integrated receiver decoder 100. Various internal units exist within the decoder device, and have connections with other units within the decoder device. However, in figures 6 and 7, the maps only disclose the connection of the decoder device with external devices such as the DVD, DVCR, etc. If *Iwamura* disclosed "connections between internal units within the first device" as recited by claim 1, the map would also include, for example, the connections between the transport packet parser 300 and the DES engine 302 *within*

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

the decoder device. Similarly, figure 5 illustrates only *external* interfaces or “ports” that can be connected to other devices. Therefore, *Iwamura* fails to teach at least this element of claim 1.

Because *Iwamura* fails to teach at least this element of claim 1, *Iwamura* cannot anticipate claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to allow claim 1. Although of different scope, amended independent claims 8, 10, 14, 25, 32, 34, 37, 47, 54, 56, and 59 recite features similar to those of claim 1. *Iwamura* therefore does not anticipate claims 8, 10, 14, 25, 32, 34, 37, 47, 54, 56, and 59 for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 23.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, claims 9 and 13 depend from claim 8, claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 10, claims 15-24 depend from claim 14, claims 26-31 depend from claim 25, claim 33 depends from claim 32, claims 35 and 36 depend from claim 34, claims 38-46 depend from claim 37, claims 48-53 depend from claim 47, claim 55 depends from claim 54, claims 57 and 58 depend from claim 56, and claims 60-68 depend from claim 59. Because *Iwamura* does not support the rejection of independent claims 1, 8, 10, 14, 25, 32, 34, 37, 47, 54, 56, or 59 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), *Iwamura* also does not support the rejection of dependent claims 2-7, 9, 11-13, 15-24, 26-31, 33, 35-36, 38-46, 48-53, 55, 57, 58, and 60-68 for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with claim 1. Therefore, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1-68 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1-68 in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that the proposed amendments of claims 1-68 do not raise new issues or

necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner.

Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully point out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicants' invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment would allow the Applicants to reply to the final rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicants submit that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 1-68.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 11, 2006

By: 
Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921